

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/876,917

Applicant(s)

DEEVI, SEETHARAMA C.

Examiner

Walter D. Griffin

Art Unit

1764

All Participants:(1) Walter D. Griffin.(2) Laura Lee.**Status of Application:** Response to Non-Final entered

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4 August 2004**Time:** 1:00pm**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claim 9

Claims discussed:

Claim 9

Prior art documents discussed:

Meyer (US 6,329,079); Mendez Acevedo et al. (US 6,475,647)

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative supplemented the response of June 2, 2004 by discussing that claim 9 is distinguished over the applied prior art in that claim 9 includes the limitation that the alloy is in the form of a sintered nanocrystalline intermetallic powder whereas the applied references disclose the melting of the alloy. Applicant's representative pointed out that an alloy that has been melted is not in the form of a sintered nanocrystalline intermetallic powder..